

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640  
Final Office Action dated: November 04, 2005  
Response dated: December 22, 2005

Page 10 of 15

### **REMARKS**

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's efforts to date and hereby responds again fully to the outstanding office action. Support for the amendment to the Claims appears at least at page 7, line 1 of the originally filed Specification.

#### **Objection of Oath/Declaration**

The Examiner has pointed out that the declaration papers on file with the USPTO do not show the post office address of inventor no. 3 (K. Forbes). It would appear that a poor photocopy of the declaration resulted in the post office address being cut off from the copy on file.

However, the undersigned hereby confirms that the postal address sought is the same as the residence address as evidenced by the Assignment listing such identical postal address as executed by inventor no. 3 (K. Forbes). Such Assignment is recorded at Reel 010463, Frame 0614.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 27-44 under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 27-44 as being indefinite in terms of the feature of "modifying contents ... by inserting ... (URL) links to said search result into said file of said electronic calendar."

The Examiner's point that "the search result is only associated with a tag" is well-taken. Accordingly, Applicants have revised each of independent Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 20, 29, 30, 31, and 32 so as to remove any such indefiniteness. Specifically, with regard to Claim 1 (as representative of each independent claim revision) there is required a feature of:

**"modifying contents of said file of said electronic calendar by inserting a copy of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file corresponding to one or more uniform resource locator (URL) links to said tag associated with said search result into said file of said electronic calendar."** (bolding added for emphasis)

Accordingly, it should now be quite clear that the feature of modifying the electronic calendar's file contents is accomplished by inserting a copy of an HTML file into the file of the electronic

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640  
Final Office Action dated: November 04, 2005  
Response dated: December 22, 2005

Page 11 of 15

calendar. This copy of the HTML file corresponds to URLs that link to the tag. The tag, as the Examiner points out, is associated with the search result. The revision to each independent claim is clearly supported within the specification as originally filed. Specifically, page 6 at line 23 through page 7 at line 2 supports the feature of modifying the electronic calendar's file contents that is accomplished by inserting a copy of an HTML file into the file of the electronic calendar. Thus, this indefiniteness rejection should now be overcome.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 27-44 under 35 USC §103(a)

"[A]s best as the Examiner is able to ascertain [the claims]", the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 27-44 as being unpatentable over Vora et al. (U.S. Patent 5,623,652) in view of Cahill Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,428,784) and further in view of Stark (U.S. Patent 5,935,210).

Applicants continue to respectfully disagree and incorporate by reference Applicants arguments made in their "Response and Amendment Made with RCE" dated April 21, 2005 and "Response and Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111" dated August 16, 2005. Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to revisit Applicants previously submitted arguments along with considering the further following comments.

Applicants believe that the clarifying amendment to the "modifying" feature of each independent claim makes it quite clear that the contents of the calendar file is modified to insert an HTML file corresponding to the tagged object. In other words, the calendar file stores the information (i.e., HTML file such as [www.microsoft.com/management.html](http://www.microsoft.com/management.html)) corresponding to the tag (i.e. tagged object such as "Bill Gates"). This is after the pre-scheduled search yields a search result that is associated with the tag. Thus, the calendar file is effectively updated with new information when the search result is generated.

While the Examiner asserts that the Vora et al. reference is a suitable base reference that includes, among other things, "modifying the file with regard to said search result", the Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner asserts that item 619 in Figure 6 of Vora et al. shows "modifying the file with regard to said search result." However, a review of such item 619 only reveals that an update

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640  
Final Office Action dated: November 04, 2005  
Response dated: December 22, 2005

Page 12 of 15

report is merely displayed in a summary format. No such file modification is disclosed in Vora et al. Further, column 16 of Vora et al. details item 619 in a consistent manner such that an update report is merely displayed in a summary format. It therefore appears very clear that Vora et al. had not intended that the update report modify the file to include an entire copy of the HTML file. Applicants respectfully submit that merely displaying such an update report in a summary format is clearly different than "modifying the file with regard to said search result" as asserted by the Examiner. Moreover, Applicants submit that nothing in Vora et al shows or fairly suggests "modifying contents of said file of said electronic calendar by inserting a copy of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file corresponding to one or more uniform resource locator (URL) links to said tag associated with said search result into said file of said electronic calendar" as is clearly claimed in at least Claim 1 of the present invention. Such language similarly exists in each independent claim as now amended.

The Examiner notes that Vora et al. "does not teach a file of an electronic calendar or a search associated with a universal resource locator (URL)", and relies further upon Cahill Jr. to "teach an apparatus and method for linking internet data (information sources) with a file of an electronic calendar." Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Cahill Jr. would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that Vora et al.'s local and external information sources be that as shown by Cahill, Jr. – namely, calendar file and Internet data, respectively. Applicants disagree. Simply stated, the Applicants submit that there is no motivation or suggestion whatsoever that Cahill, Jr. generate a search request about an object (i.e., a person or company listed within one's electronic calendar) and modify a link within such electronic calendar. Cahill Jr. is only concerned with calendar-centric information – i.e., information regarding the event itself such as user availability, time and place of meeting, ...etc. (See col. 3, lines 14-32 of Cahill, Jr).

As Applicants stated above, the instant invention as presently claimed requires that the calendar file stores the information (i.e., HTML file such as [www.microsoft.com/management.html](http://www.microsoft.com/management.html)) corresponding to the tag (i.e. tagged object such as "Bill Gates"). It is object-centric information and not the calendar-centric information that is stored at the calendar file in the form of an HTML file. Nothing in Cahill Jr. shows or fairly suggests this claimed feature.

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640  
Final Office Action dated: November 04, 2005  
Response dated: December 22, 2005

Page 13 of 15

Applicants have amended each independent claim in such a manner so as to more clearly present the scope of patent protection sought. Specifically, an important aspect of the present invention as described is to avoid the need to manually update information gathered about a person or company listed within one's electronic calendar. See Applicants' original Background section at page 2, lines 8-21. More generally, embodiments of the invention provide for updating search information related to a person or other entity, or object, in a calendar entry (p. 3, line 3-4 and 21-23).

The present invention overcomes this problem by automatically generating a search request — e.g., about a person or company listed within one's electronic calendar and updating the result of the search request in a pre-scheduled manner. Updating with regard to the search result is accomplished by modifying contents of a file of the electronic calendar by inserting a copy of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file corresponding to one or more uniform resource locator (URL) links to the tag associated with the search result into the file of the electronic calendar. Such language, or substantially similar language, is now specifically and clearly claimed in each independent claim. As mentioned above, clear support for this precise amendment to the Claims appears at least at page 7, line 1 of the originally filed Specification. By modifying the actual electronic file contents in this manner, the calendar user can access the electronic calendar at any time and receive full and current information updates about a person or company listed within their electronic calendar. This differs greatly from the mere display of portions of information (e.g., summary format) as shown in Vora et al. and further differs greatly from the calendar-centric information as shown in Cahill et al.

The Examiner further stated that the combination of Vora et al. and Cahill et al. "do not teach a search his (sic) associated with a URL." The Examiner then asserts that Stark remedies such deficiency. Applicants respectfully submit that although a URL is discussed in Stark, nothing in the reference to Stark overcomes the differences of Vora et al. and Cahill et al. from the presently claimed invention. Still further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Vora et al. nor Cahill et al. taken alone or in any combination with Stark or any other reference shows or fairly suggests the invention as presented in at least each independent claim and claims

U.S.S.N. 09/466,640  
Final Office Action dated: November 04, 2005  
Response dated: December 22, 2005

Page 14 of 15

dependent therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, 20-22, and 27-44 are allowable over this combination of references.

### Conclusion

No fee is believed due for this submission. However, Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to debit any required fee from Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. The Commissioner is further authorized to debit any additional amount required, and to credit any overpayment to the above-noted deposit account.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**Laura Ann MAHAN et al.**

By: 

**Dennis R. Haazko**  
**Reg. No. 39,575**  
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9  
CANADA  
Tel: (613) 237-5160  
Fax: (613) 787-3558  
E-mail: info@blgcanada.com

DRH/sew  
IP-OTT-116497321